Screening Form

Low-Effect Incidental Take Permit Determination and

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

Environmental Action Statement

I. HCP Information

A. HCP Name: Phillips 66 Line 300 Project Habitat Conservation Plan

B. Affected Species:

California tiger salamander (CTS; Santa Barbara County distinct population segment)

C. HCP Size (in stream miles and/or acres):

The applicant is proposing to recondition approximately 2,430 linear feet of the existing 300 Line located south of the Santa Maria Airport in Santa Barbara County, California. The area is comprised of the pipeline reconditioning corridor with a suitable buffer for staging areas, access, and excavation sloping and spoil piles, resulting in an area of 2.9 acres.

D. Brief Project Description (including minimization and mitigation plans):

Phillips 66 Pipeline LLC is proposing to recondition approximately 2,430 linear feet of the existing 300 Line, located south of the Santa Maria Airport in Santa Barbara County, California. The Santa Maria Pipe Reconditioning Project (Project) will include excavation of the existing pipeline, removal of the corrosion resistance covering, and cleaning of the pipe, and reconditioning (i.e., any necessary repairs, applying a new corrosion resistance epoxy cover).

The HCP area is calculated as a 50-foot wide corridor that is 2,510 feet in length. Within the 2.9 acres, only approximately 0.6 acres will involve direct ground disturbance within grassland habitat (this is the area of the 10-foot wide excavation to conduct the pipeline repair work). All surface disturbances will be temporary and pre-existing conditions will be restored following construction.

There are three known CTS breeding ponds within 1.24 miles of the Action Area, SAMA 6, 7, and 10. Based on information contained in the Services' Ventura Office GIS, (2010a) there are also three potential breeding ponds SAMA 5, 8, and 20 occurring within a 1.24-mile radius north and east of the Action Area.

<u>Goals and objectives for covered species</u>

Goal 1: Avoid and minimize take, in the form of injury or mortality, of CTS

Objective 1.1: Develop and conduct a pre-construction worker environmental awareness program (WEAP)

A Service approved biologist with knowledge and experience with the CTS and their habitats will conduct a pre-activity environmental education/training session for all field personnel. Topics will include field identification of the CTS; its regulatory status and the reason(s) for its decline; the laws and codes that regulate this species; the protection measures specified in the HCP that must be followed to minimize impacts to this species; and the limits of work areas, designated access routes, and staging areas. This WEAP will be repeated as necessary for new workers to the Project site.

Objective 1.2: Conduct pre-construction surveys for CTS

A Service approved biologist will conduct pre-construction reconnaissance surveys to identify suitable habitat or individual CTS that may be present within the Project area prior to the commencement of activities that could result in take of the species. The objective of pre-construction survey is to identify any CTS within the Project area and relocate them to nearby suitable habitat as well as identify any resources within the Project area that the destruction of could result in the take of CTS.

Objective 1.3: Conduct daily biological clearances and construction monitoring during

Daily pre-activity surveys will be conducted in the Project area for open trenches and excavations, exclusion fences, debris and equipment stock piles and for all equipment to ensure no CTS have migrated into the Project area. Construction work and ground-disturbing work will not be initiated until the biologist has completed the daily biological clearance. The Service approved biologist will remain onsite and be present during the installation of construction fencing and ground-disturbing activities including grading and excavation activities (e.g., clearing of vegetation and stripping of the surface soil layer) to monitor for the presence of CTS. Upon completion of site preparation and grading activities, the biologist will be available to check on the site or move listed species if need be.

Objective 1.4: Employ Stop Work Authority and Relocate any observed CTS

If a CTS is encountered within the Project area during work activities, they will be relocated to the nearest suitable habitat out of the work area by a Service approved biologist. The biologist will have the authority to order any reasonable measure necessary to avoid injury or mortality of CTS and to stop any work or activity that is not in compliance with the conditions set forth in the HCP. The Services' Ventura Office will be notified within 24 hours of any relocation or "stop work" order and this order will remain in effect until the issue has been resolved, or the animal has moved out of the work area on its own.

<u>Avoidance and Minimization Measures</u>

No.	Mitigation Measures	Biological Goal/Objective Fulfilled	Details
1	WEAP	Goal 1/Objective 1.1	All workers will attend an environmental education/training session before working in the Action Area. Crews will be regularly briefed on changes in seasonal conditions and required conservation measures.
2	Construction Window		Limit construction primarily to the dry season (April through October) when CTS are less likely to be mobile.
3	Wet Season Work		Should work be required in the wet season, work will not begin until one-half hour after sunrise and will end one-half hour before sunset, and exclusion fencing will enclose the active construction area.
4	Rain Events		Work will be suspended during rain events and all equipment will be stored within established exclusion fenced staging areas.
5	Daylight Hours		Limit construction to daylight hours.
6	Pre-construction Surveys	Goal 1/Objective 1.2	Pre-construction surveys of the pipeline alignment by Service approved biologists will occur within 14-days of initiating work within the Action Area .
7	Daily Tailgate Briefings		All workers will attend daily tailgate briefings regarding the day's work, safety, and special-status species, required impact avoidance and minimization measures, stop work authority and changing conditions.
8	Biological Monitoring		A Service-approved biological monitor will be present during any ground disturbance activities.
9	Open Trenches and Excavations		All open trenches and excavations will be ramped to provide a means of escape (earthen ramps not more than 2:1 slope). Excavations unsuitable for ramps will be covered overnight.
10	Daily Pre-activity Surveys	Goal 1/Objective 1.3	The biological monitor will conduct daily pre-activity biological clearances prior to the start of an activity that may affect CTS habitat.
11	Trash Pickup		Trash will be picked up daily and disposed of in appropriate trash containers with a lid.
12	Speed Limit		A 20 mile per hour (mph) speed limit will be observed within the Action Area.
13	Use Existing Roads		Established roads will be utilized whenever possible, no new roads are proposed, and off-road vehicle traffic will be avoided to the extent feasible.

No.	Mitigation Measures	Biological Goal/Objective Fulfilled	Details
14	Stored Construction Materials		All construction materials will be stored above-ground and/or have covers on all openings.
15	Stop-work Authority and Listed Species Relocation	Goal 1/Objective 1.4	Should CTS be observed within the Action Area, work in that area will cease until the CTS have been allowed to move out of harm's way of its own accord. If a CTS does not move out of harm's way on its own, then it will be relocated to the nearest suitable habitat away from the work area by a Service approved biologist. Only approved biologists are allowed to handle listed species.
16	Fuel Leaks		If any fuel or hazardous waste leaks or spills occur, the repair and cleanup by qualified individuals will be completed as soon as it is safe to do so.
17	Minimize Disturbance		The disturbance area associated with each work activity will be minimized to the extent practicable.
18	Access Road Clearance in Undeveloped Areas		Vehicle access corridors into undeveloped areas will be subject to pre-activity surveys by a Service approved biologist prior to vegetation clearance, if necessary, to minimize adverse effects to sensitive habitat or listed species.

Mitigation Measures

In order to determine the amount of mitigation needed, the value of the impacted habitat was calculated using the methodology outlined in Searcy and Shaffer (2008), incorporating the amount of aquatic breeding habit and upland habitat covering the site to be impacted. A mitigation ratio of 1:1 (reproductive value lost: mitigation units required) was then applied for impacts to habitats. The method described in Searcy and Shaffer (2008) attaches a value to habitat that scales with the reproductive value of the individuals estimated to be occupying an area.

For this HCP, the Service conducted a model run (utilizing Searcy and Shaffer [2008]). In order to determine the reproductive value lost through implementation of a covered activity, the model was run to calculate the reproductive value that would be lost. The proposed project would result in a loss in reproductive value of 914. To compensate for the loss of upland habitat, the applicant is proposing to purchase 1.5 credits from the La Purisima Conservation Bank to offset unavoidable impacts that would result from implementation of the project. The purchase of 1.5 credits also accounts for the 40% correction factor specific to the West Santa Maria metapopulation for mitigating outside the metapopulation in which the impact occurs.

Monitoring

Monitoring tracks compliance with the terms and conditions of the HCP and Incidental Take Permit. There are three types of monitoring: (1) compliance monitoring tracks permittee compliance with the requirements specified in the HCP and ITP; (2) effects monitoring tracks the impacts of the covered activities on the covered species; and (3) effectiveness monitoring tracks the progress of the conservation strategy in meeting the HCP's biological goals and objectives.

The monitoring measures that will be implemented to ensure compliance and/or determine if the biological goals and objectives are being met include those previously presented under *Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures*. Furthermore, documentation of compliance with the terms and conditions of the HCP will be provided in annual and final reports.

II. Does the HCP fit the following Department of Interior and Fish and Wildlife Service categorical-exclusion criteria? *The answer must be "yes" to all three questions below for a positive determination. Each response should include an explanation. If the answer is "no" to any question, the action cannot be categorically excluded, and an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement must be prepared.*

A. Are the effects of the HCP minor or negligible on federally listed, proposed, or candidate species and their habitats covered under the HCP? [516 DM 8.5(C)(2); HCP Handbook] *Consider the degree or amount of take and the impact of that take on the species. Although take may occur under project implementation, after the minimization and mitigation measures proposed in the HCP are done, the impacts must be so minor as to result in negligible effects to the species (516 DM 8).*

Yes, the effects of the HCP are minor on the federally listed CTS and its habitat. The area proposed for development only contains 2.9 acres of upland habitat for the CTS; no breeding habitat would be impacted as a result of the proposed development. Project impacts would only result in temporary impacts to CTS upland habitat. Furthermore, the applicant will be implementing measures to avoid take of individual CTS and restoring the area to pre-project conditions after implementation of the project.

B. Are the effects of the HCP minor or negligible on all other components of the human environment, including environmental values and environmental resources (e.g. air quality, geology and soils, water quality and quantity, socio-economic, cultural resources, recreation, visual resources, environmental justice, etc.), prior to implementation of the minimization and mitigation measures? [40 CFR 1508.14; 43CFR 46.205; HCP Handbook] *We do not consider a CatEx for these human environment factors; the Service's primary authority is to laws under their jurisdiction. If the HCP includes minimization and mitigation measures for these other components as part of their project, we can enforce compliance by requiring in the permit that permittees fully implement their HCP.*

Yes, the effects on the HCP are minor and negligible on all other components of the human

environment, including environmental values and environmental resources. The project would have negligible effects to air quality, geology and soils, water quality and quantity, socio-economic, cultural resources, recreation, visual resources, environmental justice, etc.

C. Would the incremental impacts of this HCP, considered together with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions) *not* result, over time, in a cumulative effects to the human environment (the natural and physical environment) which would be considered significant? [40 CFR 1508.7; 43CFR 46.205; HCP Handbook]

Yes, the incremental impacts of this HCP, considered together with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions (regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions) would not result, over time, in a cumulative effects to the human environment which would be considered significant. Any present and future projects that may occur in the vicinity of the permit area must include, when appropriate, minimization measures and mitigation that will minimize and avoid effects to environmental resources and listed species

III. Do any of the exceptions to categorical exclusions (extraordinary circumstances) listed in 43 CFR 46.215 apply to this HCP? *If the answer is "yes" to any of the questions below, the permit action cannot be categorically excluded from additional NEPA analysis, and an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement must be prepared. Each "no" response should include an explanation.*

Would implementation of the HCP:

A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?

No, the project would have no implications on the health and/or safety of the public. In fact, the project would be beneficial to public health and safety by repairing an old decrepit pipeline that is at risk of failure.

B. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as: historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990) or floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds, eagles, or other ecologically significant or critical resources?

No, the project would not have any significant impacts on natural resources and/or unique geographic characteristics such as: historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990) or floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds, eagles, or other ecologically significant or critical resources because none occur within the covered lands of the HCP.

C. Have highly controversial environmental effects (defined at 43 CFR 46.30), or

involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [see NEPA section 102(2)(E)]?

No, the project does not have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.

D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects, or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?

No, the project does not have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects, or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.

E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?

No, the project does not establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.

F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?

No, the project does not have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects because the proposed project does not have direct relationship to any other actions.

G. Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places?

No, the project does not have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places because none occur within the covered lands of the HCP.

H. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species? *Consider the degree or amount of take and the impact of the take on the species. Although take may occur under project implementation, it must be so minor as to result in negligible species effects after minimization and mitigation measures have been completed. The same concept applies when considering effects to critical habitat.*

No, the proposed project would not have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species. Yes, the effects of the HCP are minor on the federally listed CTS and its habitat. The area proposed for development only contains 2.9 acres of upland habitat for the CTS; no breeding habitat would be impacted as a result of the proposed development. Project impacts would only result in temporary impacts to CTS upland habitat. Furthermore, the applicant will be implementing measures to avoid take of individual CTS and restoring the area to pre-project conditions after implementation of the project.

The anticipated amount of take would be relatively low (up to 3 individuals) and would predominately occur within the form of capture and relocation. Overall this take would be so minor it would result in negligible species effects.

I. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law, or a requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

No, the project would not violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law, or a requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).

No, the project would not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations.

K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007).

No, the project would not limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites because these sites do not exist on site.

L. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112).

No, the project would not contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species. Alternatively, the project would result in the removal of noxious weeds.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION STATEMENT

Within the spirit and intent of the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act and other statues, orders, and policies that protect fish and wildlife resources, I have established the following administrative record.

Based on the information and analysis above, I determine that the proposed Incidental Take Permit for Campbell Home Ranch HCP qualifies for a categorical exclusion, as defined in 40 CFR 1508.4 and in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service *Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook*. Furthermore, no extraordinary circumstances identified in 43 CFR 46.215 exist for the Campbell Home Ranch HCP. Therefore, the Service's permit action for Campbell Home Ranch HCP is categorically excluded from further NEPA review and documentation, as provided by 40 CFR 1507.3; 43 CFR 46.205; 43 CFR 46.215; 516 DM 3; 516 DM 8.5; and 550 FW 3.3C. A more extensive NEPA process is unwarranted, and no further NEPA documentation will be made.

Other supporting documents:

Phillips 66 Line 300 Project Habitat Conservation Plan

Signature Approval:

Stephen P. Henry
Field Supervisor
Ventura Fish and Wildlife Office

8/11/17
Date